

SEP#475-5

AN APPEAL

TO THE

AMERICAN BOARD C. F. MISSIONS,

FROM THE

UNJUST AND OPPRESSIVE MEASURES OF THE SECRETARIES AND PRUDENTIAL COMMITTEE.

BY REV. J. D. PAXTON, D.D.

NEW HAVEN:

PRINTED BY J. H. BENHAM.

1848.



AN APPEAL

TO THE

AMERICAN BOARD C. F. MISSIONS,

FROM THE

UNJUST AND OPPRESSIVE MEASURES OF THE SECRETARIES
AND PRUDENTIAL COMMITTEE.

BY REV. J. D. PAXTON, D.D.

NEW HAVEN:

PRINTED BY J. H. BENHAM.

1848.

AN APPEAL TO THE A. B. C. F. M.,

FROM the unjust and oppressive measures of the Secretaries and Prudential Committee ; for tolerating a system of espionage and underhand dealings in their missionaries ; for assigning reasons for withholding appointments which are not the true ones, and so treating the matter as to assail character ; for either themselves or through persons admitted to the Rooms, putting out defamatory statements, which documents in the Rooms show are false ; for refusing to correct those published slanders when called on both in public and private ; for refusing to give access to, or extracts from documents known to be in the Rooms, and which would correct the calumnies ; and for refusing to give the names of those members of the Prudential Committee to whom an appeal was said to be read, July 20th, 1847, and who are said to have refused to consider it, as the following statements will show.

PREFACE.

HAD I regard only to my own case, the following publication would not appear. There are greater interests concerned than that of any individual. The course pursued by the executive of the A. B. C. F. M., and some of their missionaries, unless corrected, must before long greatly injure the Board, and do not a little discredit to Protestant missions. My opposition to the sapping and mining policy, and making it more known to the churches; the underhand measures used to send me from the mission field—the assaults made on my character, together with the combined effort of the Secretaries, W. W. and Mr. Smith, endorsed by the Committee, to make out that my statements respecting policy, were not true—their refusing to give information and withholding papers—all, all are but a small part of the facts which show unfair dealings towards those who dare honestly to think for themselves, and oppose plans and doings which they believe to be wrong. Such things ought not to be.

There are cases covered over, which if known in their details, would not a little surprise the patrons of the Board. We cannot give names without compromising persons who are not willing to be exposed to the assaults to which others have been subjected, for stating what they knew was true in the premises. Some who know the state of things, believe that I ought to make a statement to the public, that the churches may understand how their agents act.

Some, no doubt, will be unwilling to believe that the Secretaries act thus, and feel disposed to place implicit credit in their denials, or deceptive explanations, and possibly refuse to look into the case. We beg leave to remind such that the greatest oppressors and deceivers that the world ever knew, could put a plausible face on their conduct, and always, as long as they remained in power, find some who would take their part. We respectfully ask such to examine the facts which we will adduce—look at the papers, read the documents which we will specify—call for witnesses, and put the Secretaries and Committee to solemn affirmation as to the facts of the case, “the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth,” and see what the result will be. Men who have *all the power* in their hands, and the keeping of *all the documents*; reporting to those who employ them *only what they please*; if they are unwilling to make solemn affirmation as to the truth of the case, have no right to hold the place, and ought, however unwilling, to be deprived of such irresponsible power. I will allude here to one fact.

Before I left Palestine, a resolution had been taken to write the history of the Syrian Mission. The work was parcelled out and a beginning made. It is the oldest mission to the Oriental Churches, and more has been written about it than any other. That mission at first followed the open aggressive plan, up to the time Dr. Anderson visited the Mediterranean, in 1829, and had the Mediterranean Mis-

sion Church organized, and what was afterwards called the sapping and mining plan, adopted. That plan and policy were then followed up to 1838 or 1840, when there was a gradual return to the open aggressive plan. I doubt not that the history of the first period, up to 1830, or thereabout, has been finished, and most likely a copy of it sent to the Rooms; the same, I think, may be the case with the part up to 1838, or 1840; how it may be with the period since that, I have no means of knowing. Now I would like much to know, and the Board ought to know, what account this mission history gives of these changes of mission policy, through which this mission has passed. Is there a fair and truthful account given? or is all covered over, and a *pious fraud* prepared for the Churches. Several histories of missions have been given, and some of the writers have had access to the Rooms, but I have seen none that at all does justice to this most important part—the peculiar policy followed. I strongly suspect that a truthful history is not given, nor intended to be given. I thus infer from the character of their publications in the *Herald*; from the attempt of Dr. A. to deny to A. A. Phelps, the policy followed; from the sweeping denials of W. W. after intercourse with the Rooms; from the refusal of the Secretaries to give information, which I feel sure they possess; from the assertions of Mr. Smith that the aggressive policy has always been followed; from the fact that the Secretaries, who must have known his statement was not true, make the Prudential Committee endorse it, and recommend it to the Board;* and lastly, (and I say it with deep regret,) from the fact that several missionaries from that Mission were present when that report was made—as Bird, Lannan, Smith, and perhaps some others—who must have known that Smith's statement thus recommended was not true. I will not comment on the morality of allowing such false statements to be palmed on the Churches—all the Missionaries present who had been connected with Missions to the Oriental Churches, from 1830 up to 1846, the time Smith made his statement, must, I should think, know that it was not true. Why allow it to pass uncorrected?

* See annual report of the A. B. C. F. M., 1847, p. 116.

APPEAL TO THE A. B. C. F. M.

WHILE in the East, as a traveler and correspondent of a religious journal, in 1836, it was proposed to me by the brethren of the Beirut station, to remain and assist them. They stated that the absence of Messrs. Bird and Smith, on account of the sickness of their wives, had left the station so weak, that without aid, a part of the mission work, usually carried on, must be omitted. A similar request had been made to me, by the brethren at Constantinople. I consented to remain for a time at Beirut, and soon after, with the knowledge and approbation of the brethren then at that station, offered my services to the Board. The Committee did not accept my offer, and assigned as the chief reason the want of a recommendation from the mission. Neither the members of the mission, however, nor myself, had any knowledge that such a thing was required. I decided not to renew my offer, and as soon as circumstances permitted, returned to the United States.

While on mission ground, I had learned, and for the first time, the peculiar policy followed in the missions to the Oriental churches—the great silence both in preaching and books, in regard to the more gross errors and corruptions that prevailed—the plan of not separating converts from those churches, and the specific organization called the Mediterranean Mission Church, which Dr. Anderson himself helped to organize at Malta, in 1829, and which seemed designed to *prevent* such separation.

This peculiar policy was repeatedly referred to by the brethren in conversation, and, as I supposed, with a view to draw out my opinion; indeed, my opinion was at times directly asked. While I felt great doubts about it, so great was my confidence in the brethren who followed it, that at first I distrusted my own judgment, and thought that time and facts might possibly lead me to approve of it.

At length, however, and about the time I had agreed to remain, my mind became satisfied that the plan was neither scriptural nor wise, and I gave my views in answer to a *written* request from Rev. Dwight, to give them fully. At the same time he requested me not to write home on the subject. I wrote to several brethren of other stations, with whom I had become acquainted, and requested a full and frank exchange of opinions on the matter. A number of letters were received in reply, some addressed to me, and

some to Rev. W. M. Thomson, whose opinions coincided with mine. I was especially *urged* not to write home. "I do object," said one, "and I presume all the missionaries would, to going to the United States to discuss this subject. Indeed, what need of its being discussed there publicly at all? It is impossible the people at home should understand it as well as those on the ground. I again entreat you not to write home on the subject, at least for the present."

I did *not* write home on the subject; but about the time I heard from the Rooms in answer to my offer of service, it came to my knowledge *incidentally*, that one or more of those who advocated the policy followed, *had written* home and reported my views. This was done by some who knew that I had been applied to, to remain; who had sought to obtain my views on the subject, and who, I had strong reasons to believe, knew that I had, with the knowledge and approbation of the Beirut station, offered my services to the Board, and the whole was kept from me until *incidentally* I found it out! How many had written, and the general nature of their letters, I could not and did not learn until I reached the United States. Then I saw in the Herald, of April, 1838, large extracts from three letters which had been received at Beirut, in answer to my letter to Rev. Dwight, in which, at his particular written request, I gave him my views of mission policy—my objections to the plan followed, and my reasons for a more open, plain, and scriptural course. In that letter I referred to Mr. Dwight's request that I would not write home on that subject, and informed him I had not and would not; at least, until we had a mutual understanding on the matter. I informed him also, in the same letter, that I had concluded to remain at least for a time, and I have strong reasons to believe that when those letters were written, the writers knew that I had offered my services to the Board.

On seeing extracts of those letters in the Herald, woven into an argument in favor of the peculiar policy followed, I wrote to Dr. Anderson, and inquired about them, and whether my letter to which their's referred was sent home—and whether those papers were before the Committee, &c. He gave me the dates of the letters, showing that they followed close on the heels of my offer of service; said they were not intended to reflect on me, and stated that the Committee had never seen any part of them but what was published in the Herald, and did not, he thought, know that they had any reference to me, or to that effect.

Before I had received the above statement from Dr. A., I had learned from some of my friends, that the Rev. J. Bird,

who had recently returned from Syria, and who was visiting the churches, in the employ of the Rooms, said to them that the *reason* I received no appointment was, that *my views* of mission policy did not agree with that adopted by the Committee. I called on Rev. Armstrong, (Secretary) in New York, and partly for the purpose of ascertaining from him how the case was, I stated that I supposed my views of mission policy was the reason. He did not deny it. I told him that I was not alone in my views, that Rev. W. M. Thomson held the same. He said "they knew that." I stated to him the means used to draw out my opinions on the subject—the request made that I would not write home—how the whole matter of *their* writing home was concealed from me, while I was kept waiting nearly a year for an answer. He replied in substance, that personally, he was very desirous that I should be appointed, but while the matter was under consideration "those letters came," and "what-else," said he, "could the Committee do than what they did?" I replied, that if the Committee had given the *true* reason for not giving me an appointment, and given it at once without making me wait so long, I did not see that I should have much, if any cause, to blame them, whatever I might think of the way those brethren had taken to accomplish their purpose. It is due to Messrs. Temple and Adger to state, that both of them have, in letters to me, denied that they intended their letters to the Rooms should prevent my appointment.

Mr. Smith, to whom I wrote and gave my opinion on the case, has passed it in silence. *He at least* knew of my application, if not at the time he wrote, at least very soon afterwards, for I *myself* informed him, and he replied that he "considered me a missionary!" He knew I was waiting nearly a year to hear from the Rooms, and never intimated that he had written to the Rooms, what, according to W. W.'s account of the matter, not only in his published pieces in the Christian Mirror, but in his private letters to me, after at least two visits to the Rooms, was the cause of my not receiving an appointment! Had he openly opposed, and frankly told me so, I could have still esteemed him an honorable man; but who that has any regard for propriety of conduct can do so now?

The request made to me by at least two of the brethren, that I should not begin the discussion at home, I had, as I promised, complied with. But when I saw that all the strong points of the three arguments of Smith, Adger, and Temple, had been taken and wrought over by one of the strong men at the Rooms, and spread before the churches in the pages

of the Herald, April, 1838, I felt that I was no longer bound to be silent. The discussion had been begun on the other side, and with the fearful odds of four to one, and the first blow. I felt free to examine the fourfold argument, and as I had weighed three parts of it in Palestine, and found it sadly wanting, I concluded to try how much it had gained by the passage, and the additions made at the Rooms. I did this in three letters addressed to Dr. Anderson. They were not answered. This did not much surprise me, although at that time I regretted it. I knew the subject was not fully discussed; I knew that I could reach but a small part of those who had the condensed arguments of four men sent them in the Herald, while neither the Herald, *nor any of the papers that copied from it*, would insert my numbers. That no notice was taken of my argument did not surprise me; I had seen too much of the *tactics* of those who wish to keep the truth from the people, to expect a public discussion. Who that has paid any attention to the papal and Jesuitical policy, was surprised that Bishop Hughes did not fairly meet Kirwan before the public, on the main points at issue? Occasionally a papal priest or Jesuit puts out a *bold face*, but if taken up on the main points, how sure to back out.

That the plan was, by silence, to prevent public attention from being fixed on the subject, I did not doubt. I have the statement of a highly esteemed brother in the ministry, Rev. E. P. Humphrey, who, soon after my letters came out, saw Dr. Anderson, and had some conversation with him on the subject. Dr. A. gave it as his opinion that the mission policy, as then followed, was right, and could be defended; and assigned as a reason why my argument passed without notice, that it would not, as he thought, be much known, or to that effect. While at that time I was willing to have pursued the matter, had their policy been farther defended, I did not feel disposed to urge it against their wishes. There were, indeed, several allusions to the subject, in the two or three following years, of which I might have taken advantage, as in Herald, 1839, page 363, in the instructions given to Dwight, Beadle, and Sherman, and in 1842, pages 431-2, in which latter place I did not doubt that a reference was made to myself, as one of those ignorant of the language, and who made only a brief stay,* and was thus not qualified to judge. Still, as it was more like the concealed hit of the Jesuit, than the open attack of the Protestant, I let it pass. A friend who had long observed Dr. Anderson, said, "he is foxy." I considered this one of his tricks. I had observed

* I was on mission ground between three and four years.

indications of a change of policy, and had been assured of it in private letters, and was willing the past should be forgotten, if the present and future were made right, and no unrighteous attempts were made to deny the past and thus falsify history, and pass off a further deception on the churches.

The whole matter had much passed from my mind, when not long since, a series of most disparaging attacks were made on me over the signature of W. W. in the *Christian Mirror*, owned and edited by Rev. A. Cummings, a corporate member of your Board. Some one had published an extract from one of my letters, addressed to Dr. Anderson, in 1839, in which I gave an account of the Mission church, *as it existed when I was in Palestine*, and stated the fact that up to the time *I left*, 1838, no converts had been separated from those corrupt churches and received into the Mission church.

This statement, which I believe strictly true when made, was not alone assailed, but it was asserted that the statements, (no exceptions were made,) in the letters, were declared by persons who knew the facts, to be "directly opposite the truth in the case"—that all was the result of prejudice on my part, owing to my not receiving an appointment, but which the missionaries and Committee thought I ought not to receive—or to that effect.

The whole statement was so worded as to make the impression that the writer had received his information from the Rooms. I replied, and appealed to the argument in the *Herald*, April, 1838, as containing most of the facts which I had adduced, and as advocating the policy against which I argued. I appealed to the Rooms for the truth of my statements; I appealed to Messrs. Temple and Smith, who were in this country, and had advocated the policy which I opposed, and whose facts I had mainly used in my answer to their arguments. I sent a copy of my letters to the editor of the *Mirror*, and requested him as a matter of plain justice, to read them, and compare them with the argument in the *Herald*, April, 1838, and say in his paper whether my statement of facts as to the policy followed was not true. I stated I had no wish then to renew the discussion, and would only touch on such points as self-defense required.

The Secretaries at the Rooms would not answer my call, although they must have known that my statements were true, and must have seen that I was grossly calumniated. Neither Temple nor Smith answered to my call. The editor of the *Mirror* would not say whether my facts agreed, or did not agree with the facts in the argument, which I was answering; but immediately admitted another piece from W. W. still more offensive than the first, in which most of his charges were renewed, with much in the matter and manner, which seemed designed to disparage me and wound my feelings.

I declined discussing any more with such a man publicly, but addressed him privately, and simply asked him for his authority for various charges which he had publicly made. He answered my letters but refused to give me the information; three or four times was he written to, but without obtaining what was asked, while several

things were let out in his replies, among much that seemed designed to wound feelings, which pointed to the Rooms as the authority.

I then wrote to Dr. Anderson. Part of the offensive charges of W. W., Dr. A. must have known were not true, and most of the remainder could be affirmed or denied only at the Rooms, or by persons who had received their information from that source. I called his attention to various parts of the false and offensive charges, and put the question *directly* whether things were so and so, as W. W. alleged; whether W. W. had authority from the Rooms to write thus and thus. He admitted that W. W. had been there, and that he had conversation with him, but as to the *precise points*, on which I mainly desired information, he evaded every one. He said that Mr. Green had the principal conversation with W. W. This looked like being "soxy," a scheme to slip out himself; still I was not sure but it might be so, and concluded to try Mr. Green. I took a number of extracts from W. W.'s pieces, and transmitted them to Mr. Green, requesting him, as a matter of equity and justice to let me know whether W. W. had authority from the Rooms, in whole or in part, for those statements; if he had authority then I asked the Secretaries for their authority for said statements. If W. W. had in part their authority, to tell me *how much*—and if he had no authority to state that fact, that I might use it in self-defense. Mr. Green admitted that W. W. had been at the Rooms, and had asked for information—said he told him only what he believed to be true—but *would not tell me what that was*—would not say whether it agreed with the statements publicly made by W. W.—would not answer to a *single case* of the published statement. He informed me, however, that about the time he wrote me, he had written to W. W. that he did not see that any good would grow out of the discussion—and he gave me to understand, in effect, that if my influence as a minister, or my character, was made to suffer from the charges of W. W., it was to be ascribed mainly to my noticing them, to my giving them publicity. Now might not the same be said of a large part of the outrages committed in society—outrages which bring men to the penitentiary and the gallows? If those injured would but be quiet, what a fine time rogues and ruffians, as well as slanderers, would have! And this from the Secretaries of a Board which professes to send the gospel of truth, and peace, and righteousness, to the world, as the only sure means of reforming the morals and saving the souls of men! I wrote to Mr. Green again, requesting him, as he said he told W. W. only what he *believed* was the truth, to tell me *what that was*. That I was slow to believe that W. W. had authority from the Rooms for all his statements, but that the Secretaries could tell how it was. No answer could be had! In regard to the Mission church which W. W. asserted had never existed, and gave the Secretaries as his authority, I asked Dr. Anderson, if the reports of the general meetings at Beirut, 1836 and 1837, Smyrna, Sept. 1837, and Jerusalem, 1838, did not make mention of it? He would not answer. I inquired of Mr. Green—he was equally silent. I wrote to Rev. E. Smith, who was present at all those meetings, and asked him to state the facts

about the Mission church, the existence of which was now denied ; he answered my letter, but would give no statement about the Mission church. I wrote him again, and reminded him of facts, in which he himself acted a part—told him my statements, which he must know were true, had been called in question, and called on him as a minister of the gospel, a professed follower of “the true and faithful witness,” to state the facts of the case. He refused to do it, and sailed to Syria, his mission field, *under your patronage*.

As Rev. J. F. Lanneau, of the same mission, who was present at three of the above mentioned general meetings, returned to the U. S. about that time, I wrote to him and reported the case, requesting of him a frank statement of the facts. The following is his reply :
 “Rev. J. D. PAXTON. *Dear Brother,*

1st. It was a fact that at the time I joined the mission, (March, 1836,) there existed an organization called the Mediterranean Mission Church, organized at Malta, a few years previously, embracing most of the members of the missions of the A. B. C. F. M., among the Oriental Churches in Turkey, Syria, and the Holy Land. 2d. According to the constitution of this church, no member could be admitted to any branch of the same, without the consent of all the others. 3d. As an individual, I did not join this church, not approving of its adaptation to the practical operation of our respective missions in the East. 4th. The subject of a Mission church, in all its bearings, was taken up and discussed at the general meeting of the mission, 1836, and again in 1837, when, if I remember correctly, it was resolved that on account of our peculiar circumstances, and the objections against the workings of this plan, that we confer with the other branches of the Mediterranean church, and suggest the propriety of its dissolution, and allowing to each mission to form its own distinct organization. 5th. As Mr. Smith was expecting to go to Smyrna soon after the meeting in 1837, my impression is that he was requested to bring this subject, as well as some other missionary matters, before the brethren in Turkey, and state to them our views of missionary policy. 6th. I do not remember whether a verbal or written answer to these communications was returned through Mr. Smith, at the general meeting at Jerusalem, in 1838, but my impression is that the whole subject was then and there so disposed of, that our mission has ever since acted independently of our brethren of the other missions in this matter, and have admitted members to our communion at Beirut and Jerusalem, only on the vote of the brethren of the different stations composing the mission to Syria and the Holy Land.”

Here all the facts I had stated about the mission church are confirmed, and more in detail than I gave them. It existed and was in operation, from 1829, when *Dr. Anderson* was one of the Committee who reported the plan, and helped to organize it, up to 1838. Nor was its dissolution followed immediately by any regular church organization, but a kind of communion, as Rev. S. Wolcott has assured the public in a printed letter. [See *Christian Mirror*, May 7, 1846.] As Mr. Smith, at the very time W. W. was making these charges,

began a set of numbers in the N. Y. Observer, on the mission work in Syria, (July 18, 1846,) I could not but notice statements made by him about the policy pursued, which *differed widely* from the facts of the case, and from the ground taken and defended in his letter to me of 1837, large extracts of which were published in the Herald, 1838. And I was not a little surprised, subsequently, to see that the Report of the A. B. C. F. M. for 1846, not only notices his late account of the policy followed, but makes the Committee *recommend* it to the Board and churches, *different* and *contradictory* as it manifestly is to the account, which is published in the Herald of April, 1838. I wrote to Mr. Smith, calling his attention to the statements he had made, and the manifestly false impression they made as to policy followed in the missions to the Oriental churches; reminded him of his letter to me in 1837, in which he had defended what was called the "sapping and mining" policy, and told him that he owed it to himself and the truth to correct the false impression, and that I called his attention to it that he might do this. He replied, in effect, that when he wrote those late numbers, he thought he was telling the truth, and would not now correct it—that as to its agreement with what he had written me in 1837, he could not say, as he had not that letter with him. I replied immediately, in substance, that a copy of his letter to me of 1837, was at the Mission House, where he himself had sent it—that he owed it to his own character to set the matter right—that others as well as myself had noticed the disagreement between what he now said and the plan advocated in the Herald, April, 1838, by Adger, Temple, himself, and the Rooms—that if he did not correct it, I might feel it due to truth to do it. He returned to Palestine without correcting his statements.

I will now give an extract from his late account of the mission policy, and also from his former account, that all may see how the matter stands.

In the first of his late numbers, July 18, 1846, under the head of "*the nature of the instructions*" given, he makes this statement:

"It has not been limited to a simple inculcation of the saving truths of the gospel, without bringing into notice their bearing upon the current errors and superstitions. The pioneers of the Syrian mission, Fisk and King, Bird and Goodell, began by openly and directly attacking those errors and superstitions, and this feature of direct aggression has ever characterized our instructions. In our public services, whatever doctrine or duty is under consideration, its bearing upon existing errors and abuses is uniformly pointed out. Our books and tracts are of the same character. One is a translation of Nevin's on Popery; another, a still more pointed exhibition of the errors of the same faith, in a series of letters from Mr. Bird, and several more have the same aggressive character. All these are more called for than any other of our books, except the Scriptures and school books. Such instructions not only increase the sensitiveness of the people to the faults of their clergy, but open their eyes to the errors of their faith. Their confidence in their priests is gradually withdrawn, while in us it is extended. In such a state of sentiment respecting

the faults of their church and clergy, if spiritual life is imparted to any, they are unfitted to remain in their former ecclesiastical connections. The consequence is, that every individual, of whom we have had reason to hope that he has been born again, has left his church and come to us for the ordinances of the gospel." To enlarge the extracts would make the case stronger.

Compare this with his former account of the matter, Herald, April, 1838. I had, in my letter to Dwight, objected to the plan of leaving converts in those corrupt churches—of, as it was termed, "working in them," and not separating converts from them, and among other reasons made this statement.

"Those churches are, it will be admitted, in fatal error. It is another gospel they hold. There is a deep and deadly idolatry. I hold that the worship of the Virgin is as damnable as the worship of Moloch or the Devil. She is certainly the better character, but that does not save her worship from being idolatry, and idolatry is a damning sin, and God's people are not to have religious fellowship with idolaters. (1 Cor. v. 11; and vi. 9.) Fuaz, Tannoos, and Trodd, the best converts here, all say that they cannot remain in those churches without partaking of idolatry—that they have tried it. The plan, then, at the outset, systematically sets aside a Scripture rule. Now I must doubt any system that thus sets aside a Scripture canon. When brother Shaufler sent the converted Jew to an idolatrous church, he may have had the advice of a supposed expediency, but certainly not of Scripture." Most of Mr. Smith's answer to this we have in Herald, April, 1838; part of it I give. "I have had a desire that they should, [remain in the corrupt churches.] if they could do it conscientiously, and not transgress the Scriptures. Whether they can, I have left to themselves to decide, knowing that there are now in the Greek church, in Russia, a considerable number of pious persons, and that there have been such in the Latin church in latter days. That they would thereby compromise themselves with idolatry, I do not think so easily decided. I know the opinion of our native brethren at Beirut. The native brethren at Constantinople think differently, and the latter are, for aught I can see, as valuable men as the other. That to partake of idolatry is a great sin, a fatal sin, I have no doubt, though I do not think the passage 1 Cor. v : 11, is exactly to the point." In 1837 he preferred their remaining in those churches, the danger of partaking of damnable sin notwithstanding; but in 1846 is greatly pleased at their coming out. No change here! I objected to the plan followed, that it was silent respecting the damnable errors—the deep and fatal departures from the gospel—the little done to inform the people what the gospel was, and the extent of their departures from it—and the necessity, on peril of perdition, of "turning from these errors and receiving the truth." Mr. Smith has a long reply: a part of which is in the Herald, April, 1838, whence I take this extract, as far as *there* given:

"I have habitually preached that baptism could not save them, and have often warned them that there was no merit in their fasting. I have told them that no one but God could forgive their sins, and given

the reasons. I have taught that none but he is to be worshiped, and that J  sus is the only mediator, and have proved it out of the Scriptures, preaching whole sermons on it." "*I did not think it best, in a mixed congregation, many of whom were not at all prepared, perhaps, for the announcement, to say, in so many words, you must not worship the Virgin, nor confess to the priests, nor pray to the saints. I left them to draw their own inferences for themselves. I thought this, and still think it, the most effectual way of accomplishing my object.*" This latter part, marked as Italics, (and much of it is thus marked in Mr. Smith's letter now before me,) is omitted in the Herald. All must see that it *qualifies* his whole mode of preaching. His own statement here shows that he did not always, nor usually, if ever, point out specifically the errors opposed to the truth. He preached—he left it to the people to *infer*; whereas, in his late numbers he says they *always* did point out the errors opposed, and "*have all along followed this aggressive course.*" The question is not *now* which course is the best, but whether Mr. Smith's late statement, that they always pointed out the errors, agrees with the facts. And how could the Secretaries and Committee be ignorant of this with the documents which they possessed—his letter in their hands?

Again, he says in answering my remarks about the great sin of idolatry, "Idolatry is a great sin, but they don't feel it so. On the contrary, when the worship of the Virgin is attacked, instead of being conscience-smitten, the most religious feelings they have are wounded, and they feel conscience-bound to rise up against you. Were there no other way of getting at them, we should have to try this, or leave them. But there is another way, and it is the most direct one I know of—charge upon them their sins of heart and life, what I might call their personal sins." Again. "I have not concealed my opinion on these points, nor observed that guarded silence of which you speak. When I have found an enlightened individual in a state of mind to receive conversation on them more fully, and yet trammelled by them, or an inquirer embarrassed by them, I have spoken freely."

Now how do these statements agree with his late declarations, that always the aggressive course has been followed—of pointing out the errors and superstitions which came in the way? Mr. Smith admitted also, in 1837, that the same caution was used in regard to the books circulated, and that there was a rule adopted by the Syrian Mission, (and if I am not mistaken, mainly through his influence,) which greatly limited, yea, almost stopped the circulation of books such as Bird's, to which he refers in his late numbers. He specified *three* copies of Bird's book given away in perhaps three as many years, on *special application* being made for them!

Now the point is, how to reconcile this with the impression which his late statement made, as to the aggressive character, and free circulation of the books; and how could the Secretaries and Committee be ignorant of this? His letter to me is at the Rooms, and large extracts from it they had printed. The greater part here quoted had, however, been kept back. Finding I could gain no information from

the Secretaries, I addressed an appeal from them to the Prudential Committee, of which the following is the substance. As I knew from Dr. Anderson's own statement that documents had come to the Rooms touching my case, which the Committee had not seen, and as I was strongly inclined to the opinion that they had acted in the dark, and were still kept in the dark in some matters, I stated to them the circumstances in which I had been led to offer my services, and requested them to read my letters to Dr. A. of Nov. 1836, and April, 1838, and his letter to me, June, 1838. I stated how my views of mission policy had been drawn from me by repeated application and written request, while I was asked not to write home on the subject. That others had written home and reported my views, and kept that fact from me. I requested them to read my letter of Dec. 1838, to Dr. A., and his reply. Stated how I was led to examine the argument in the Herald, April, 1838, in three letters to Dr. A. I called their attention to the late disparaging attack on me by W. W., which is so made as to create the impression that he had his authority from the Rooms, and in case he had not, nothing was easier than for the Secretaries to state that fact, which, however, they had refused to do, although appealed to again and again—I desired them to read my letters to the Secretaries. That to Dr. A., Aug. 1846. His reply, Sept., 1846. To Mr. Green, Dec. 1846. His reply, Jan. 1847. My second to Mr. Green, Jan. 1847, to which, as to the main point, I received no reply. I called their attention to my request made to the Secretaries to know if the reports of the general meetings of the missions, as above referred to, did not make such mention of the mission church as to show that it was in operation. This information had been refused me by the Secretaries. I made my appeal to them and requested information on the following points :

1. Did the missionaries oppose my appointment, as W. W. alleges, and was that the reason why I received none ? Did they protest, etc. ?
2. Did Mr. Smith oppose, as W. W. has published, and in two private letters alledged ? and this after making at least two visits to the Rooms. If so, I asked copies of such papers. If the Secretaries have thus through W. W. made known these facts, with a view to disparage me, I asked, as a matter of common justice, to see those papers.
3. I desired to know if the reports of the general missionary meetings above referred to, did not make mention of the mission church, and record action about it, which showed its existence. I urged my appeal from the Scriptural duty of promoting truth between man and man—from the plain teaching of God's word in relation to calumny and evil reports, Ps. 151—from the relation of the Committee to a great religious institution, designed to promote religion and good morals in the world ; and entreated them to do me the justice which the Secretaries refused.

I received in reply a letter from Mr. Green, *one of the Secretaries complained of*, stating that in the absence of the person to whom my appeal was addressed, it came into his hands—was read to the Committee at their meeting, July 20, 1847, but that the Committee did not feel it their duty to look into the matter, alledging that I had no

injustice done me by any one connected with the Rooms. It does not state how the Committee ascertained the fact that no injustice had been done me, without looking into the documents to which I had referred them. I am led to infer that they took the word of the Secretaries, from whose course I had appealed!!

With advice which would command respect, did I think it needful to give names, I prepared a memorial to the A. B. C. F. M., about to meet at Buffalo. Circumstances prevented me from bringing it before them, and the matter has been deferred until now.

There are a number of points, to which I wish especially to call the attention of my readers and the members of the Board.

1st. If the missionaries opposed and protested against my appointment, then Dr. Anderson made statements to me in 1838, which cannot be reconciled with truth. On seeing those extracts from letters of Temple, Adger, and Smith, on mission policy, I wrote Dr. Anderson, inquiring about those letters, and whether my letter to which they were answers was sent to the Rooms—whether all had been before the Committee, with other questions, intending to ascertain whether they were not the cause why I was not appointed. Dr. A. answered, “The letters were sent me as a matter of information, and not to reflect on you, and with no reference to the question of your appointment as a missionary, for the writers knew nothing of your offer of service. No part of this correspondence, except that published in the Herald, has been seen by members of the Committee, nor am I aware that any member knows that the letters which are in part published in the April Herald, 1838, had any relation to you.* When Mr. Smith sent me a copy of his letter, he sent me also a copy of yours to Mr. Dwight, to which his was a reply.” Dr. A. also mentions Adger’s letter, as also Temple’s, and says, “He (Mr. Temple) speaks of your letter as frank, kind, and Christian, in its spirit, and he trusted would do them good, though he dissented from some of your practical views.” In a postscript he adds, “As I have understood in some way that you suppose Mr. Smith and Mr. Temple wrote against your appointment, I would say that I have no knowledge of their alluding to the subject before they had heard of the result.”

Here is a double denial that those brethren opposed, or even knew of my offer of service when they wrote. How can this be reconciled with W. W.’s statement both in public and private, and that after repeated visits to the Mission House. Which are we to believe? Nor can I reconcile Dr. Anderson’s statement above made, with what Dr. Armstrong had admitted to me just before. I do most solemnly affirm that in reply to my remark, that my views of mission policy, I supposed, was the reason I received no appointment, he did not deny, and I considered him as admitting it; but he remarked to this effect, and I believe in these words, That he was desirous that I

* NOTE. The fair inference is that the Committee saw those parts only after they were published; and this was not until more than twelve months after my application reached the Rooms.

should receive an appointment, but "then those letters came, and what else," said he "could the Committee do than what they did?" I replied that if the Committee had assigned the *true* reason, and that at once, without keeping me in suspense so long, I did not see that I should have much cause to complain of them, whatever I might think of the way taken by the writers to effect their object.

Why was Dr. Anderson so careful in 1838, to make it out that those brethren had no hand in the matter, and in 1846 and 1847 to allow a man, after visiting the Mission House, to publish those brethren as opposed? And why, when called on in public, and appealed to in private, refuse to put the matter right? Was it because in 1838 he wished to keep me silent on the whole matter, and hush it up, while in 1846 he wished to have me defamed for *daring* to state facts about the mission policy, which he had carefully kept concealed from the public?

Take another fact in its bearings on this case. Not long after my first piece in self-defense against the disparaging attack made on me by W. W., I received a letter signed A. A. Phelps, informing me that he had no doubt that Dr. Anderson was W. W.'s authority for the charges made against me. That he himself had heard Dr. A. make almost identically the same statement. See *Christian Mirror*, May 7, 1846, where he repeats and gives Wolcott's letter. I replied to the writer that his statements surprised me, and requested him to give me the facts of the case as nearly as he could. He replied, "In February last, on my return from the Convention at Syracuse, Dr. A. was in the cars—inquired what we had done in Convention—asked to see the address—on reading the extract from you, he said it was not true—that the Syrian mission did not pursue that policy—that they had abandoned it long ago. This led to an inquiry wherein you were wrong and an attempt to explain, and at length to the inquiry, why, if things were as Dr. A. stated, your representations had never been corrected? To which he replied that they (the Secretaries) made it a rule not to reply to any communications addressed to them in the public papers. To which I said they need not have done it themselves—that they had friends enough to do it—that it was very strange that none of the missionaries had done it—that Mr. Smith had been in this country a great deal, and written a great deal for the papers, and it was singular that he had never corrected you, &c. Then came the remarks concerning you personally. The substance of them, and the impression they left on my mind, were to this effect: that you were unfriendly to the Board—that your letters were the result of that unfriendliness—that your representations on that account were unjust in their bearings on the Board and the missionaries, being those of a prejudiced witness—that particularly what you say in the extract quoted was not true—that the missionaries in Syria had a church, and that it was not their policy to do as you represent.

When I asked him how you came to be unfriendly, he mentioned your acquaintance with Mrs. Dodge, your application for an ap-

pointment, and their refusal to appoint you. I think he said in terms that you were 'piqued' at not being appointed; and when I asked why they did not appoint you, the answer was, the Committee did not think him a suitable man."

My statement, which Dr. A. here says is not true, was made Spring, 1839—written less than one year from the time I left Palestine. In the very first sentence of the passage quoted in the address, I refer *distinctly* to the state of matters, and policy followed, *up to the time I left*, and I insist upon it that my statement is true, as to its fair import. It does not relate to 1846, but to what existed up to the Spring of 1838, when I left; and yet he asserts my statement was not true. He asserts that the missionaries had a church—Wolcott says they had not, but only a communion, and that my statement of things, as existing when I saw them, was "a true bill," as he believes.

Why could not Dr. Anderson, if he thought my statements not correct, point out the errors when they first appeared? Why did he not tell Rev. Humphrey, my neighbor, that my account was not true? Then he justified the missions, and took the ground that the policy followed, the "sapping and mining," could be defended. Why not meet me fairly and openly, like a man and a Protestant? why resort to the *low, underhand, Jesuitical mode of insinuation*, "whispering," assigning reasons which he knows are false? Their rule is, it would seem, not to answer public statements; but it allows them to travel about at the expense of the Board, and privately assail persons, putting out statements, which papers in their own possession show are false!

Compare Dr. A.'s statement above given with that made by W. W., a few weeks afterwards. "He, (Mr. Paxton) testifies that converts are refused admission into the mission church, and are forced against their will to retain their old church connection. A grave charge this, if true; but what are the facts in the case? These converts are taken into the full fellowship of the mission church, and are under the same kind, fraternal watch of the missionaries, as if they literally belonged to it. They enjoy all its privileges and sympathies, and why does not Mr. P. give us the whole story? Perhaps I can give a clue to this secret. Some years since Mr. Paxton traveled in the East. He visited Palestine, and became affianced to a missionary lady there. Her missionary zeal, no doubt, burned brighter in her heart than any *other flame*. Mr. Paxton applied for an appointment as missionary to Palestine. But owing to circumstances, which I do not think bear particularly on his moral character, the missionaries there, and the Committee at home, thought it not best that he should be appointed. He returned to this country, and wrote a series of letters in a newspaper, against the mission in Syria. From these letters Mr. Phelps makes his extracts. Those who know the facts in the case, say that those published statements of Mr. P. are *directly opposite* to the truth in this matter. And who will wonder—a prejudiced mind cannot be relied on, though honest, either in its opinions or interpretations of

facts. And shall we trust the opinions of a man, or his version of facts, who stands thus affected and prejudiced, when they come in conflict with the testimony and judgment of a whole corps of missionaries there, and with those of returned missionaries too? His testimony is contradicted by scores of witnesses, each of whom are as well qualified to judge in the matter as he. I appeal to the world to decide so far, if Mr. Phelps has brought proof to sustain his charges, that would not be ruled out of a court of justice?"

All must perceive the general agreement of Dr. A.'s and W. W.'s statements. Both deny my statements to be true; both charge me with prejudice; and both alledge that my prejudice arose from not receiving an appointment; both refer to Mrs. P. Now Dr. Anderson and Greene both admit that W. W. was at the Rooms about the time he wrote. Who can doubt that W. W. had his authority from that source?

Now Dr. A. knew that my opinions on mission policy were made up long before I heard from the Rooms. His letter to me of Jan., 1839, proves that my letter to Dwight, giving my views in full, together with the replies of Temple, Adger, and Smith, were at the Rooms, months before my application was answered. He knew that the facts in my three letters to him were mostly taken from the Herald. He must have known that my statement about the mission church was true; yet he says my statement is "not true"—that my account of the policy is "not true"—and charges all to prejudice, and the origin of that prejudice to my not receiving an appointment.

The statement of W. W. is only a more *reckless* repetition of the same things, with a manifest attempt to break down my character, which he seems to think he has so done, that my testimony would not be admitted in a court of justice. It is a custom of the Jesuits to employ unprincipled men to assassinate, or destroy the character of those who incur their displeasure. As Dr. A. knew at the time that my statements were true, so I have evidence to believe that W. W. did when he wrote his pieces.

About the time W. W.'s second piece came out against me, repeating substantially the charges as made in the first, and in a still more offensive way, I received a letter from A. A. Phelps, containing the following information:

"Mr. Warren did visit the Mission Rooms between his first and second letters respecting you. He wrote me as the result of it, proposing that if I would substantially retract what I had said about the Sandwich Islands and Oriental missions, he would let me off easily; otherwise he proposed to make a 'triumphant termination' of the controversy. Of course, I spurned his proposal. His language is as follows, the letter being dated Windham, June 1, 1846. 'I have spent most of the past week in Boston. I have carefully searched documents there, and been kindly permitted to lay my hand upon whatever I wanted in the archives of the Missionary Rooms;' and other items are stated, showing the amount of information he had obtained, and by which he supposed he would be

able; if I did not retract, to make, as he says, 'a triumphant termination' of the controversy."

"I will farther state, that when Warren wrote his second letter, he had a letter in his possession from the Rev. Mr. Wolcott, in which the latter informed him fully in regard to the policy of those missions generally, and expressed his belief that your representation of affairs was strictly true, as they were when you were there. The published statement of Mr. Wolcott, which I send you with this, bears you out in all points but one, respecting those missions generally. You will see in my remarks accompanying that statement, that I said, I believed he would say so if it were necessary. The truth was, he *had* said to me in a private note, accompanying the statement for the public. His language was, 'I should say that your extract from Mr. Paxton, which I have carefully examined, was a *true bill* of what he found in Beirut. It is mainly true still, except in regard to the plan or policy of the mission, and on that point there has been since he was there, a very marked advance of sentiments in the mission, in the direction indicated in the inclosed.' All this was virtually before Warren when he wrote his second letter of the series; and substantially all this, and more was actually before him at an earlier period, in Wolcott's letter to him, named above—a letter, by-the-by, which Wolcott made Warren send me, in proof that he had told Warren as much as he had told me. You will see that there has been some working behind the scenes, but it is too long a story to tell you more of it. Enough that Warren was handsomely caught in his own snare."

Here we have light on various points which touch the core of the subject under controversy. As W. W. had intercourse with the Secretaries before he wrote his first attack on me, and did little more than repeat in a more rash manner, what Dr. A. had told A. A. Phelps a little before, in a public car, so now, after I had appealed to the pages of the Herald, April, 1838, for the truth of my facts—had appealed to the Rooms—had appealed to Messrs. Temple and Smith for the truth of my statements, both as to facts and the mission policy followed—W. W. visits the Rooms, spends nearly a week there, has free access to papers, &c.—moreover he receives a written statement from Wolcott, who had lately returned from Palestine, assuring him of the truth of my statements, and when he did not give a due weight to this statement of Wolcott, he was made to transmit it to A. A. Phelps, in proof that he had information which he had suppressed, and *after all* he goes on in a second and third letter to abuse me in the public prints, and represent my statements as unworthy of credit.

Now if the Secretaries let him know the truth in the case, where was his truth or honesty, and where was it any way, in continuing to make such public charges as he did, with Wolcott's statement before him. And if the Secretaries withheld the truth from him—made a wholly false impression on his mind, as Dr. A. had done on A. A. Phelps, where is their truth or honesty? When I

frankly and respectfully appealed to them, why not as gentlemen and Christian ministers meet the call? Was it because they had already told W. W. one story, and were thus committed; and depended on the *weight of influence* which *their relation to the Board* gave them to carry their points *per fas et nefas*? That W. W. was their instrument—that they could have stopped him at once, I infer from various things. His statements are substantially the same as those of Dr. A. He had repeated intercourse with the Secretaries, his repeated references to information, which, if he really had, it must have come from the Rooms, and the promptness with which he did stop, and even suppress a piece, as soon as a wish to that effect reached him from the Rooms, as the following facts will show.

I wrote a private note to W. W., making a third or fourth application for his authority for statements made to my disparagement. His reply bears date Dec., 1846. He refused to give the information asked, but informed me that another paper had come out containing an extract from my letters to Dr. A., and says, "I shall fearlessly encounter your testimony. My first communication I send you, the second is yet unwritten. I will send you the numbers." On the 28th Dec. I wrote to Mr. Greene, giving him several extracts from W. W.'s offensive statements, and called on him, as a matter of justice and equity, to let me know whether W. W. had any, and how much, if any, authority from the Rooms, for such statements? Mr. Greene answered my letter the 7th Jan., 1847, a few days after W. W.'s letter was dated. He refused to give any answer to the points put to him, but remarked, "In a letter which I had occasion to write a few days ago, to the person who signs himself W. W. in the Christian Mirror, I remarked that I could not see that any good was likely to accrue from continuing the controversy between you and him. I would repeat the remark to you. I have no evidence that your own character, or that of Mrs. P. suffers from any thing which W. W. has written, or indeed, that any body remembers or even knows what he has written, whose knowledge or opinion is of the least real consequence to your usefulness, or welfare, except so far as your own agency has made it known and remembered." (Not very complimentary to W. W.)

So, then, however disparaging and slanderous the statements, and although so made as to carry the authority of the Rooms, and made in a *public print*, widely circulated in New England, and some copies sent to foreign lands, yet, as it might not be much known in my immediate field of labor, I must let all pass!! The slanderer may have free access to the Rooms, receive information *notoriously false* as to the general impression it makes, and so publish it as to create the belief that it has the authority of the Secretaries, and when they are asked if they gave such authority, the above is the reply: and this by the Secretaries of a great religious institution, who, from the nature of the case, have a great and wide-spread power to affect the character of others, for good or for

evil—to whitewash those who please them, and to blacken those who do not.

But to return to the point we had before us. W. W.'s letter, announcing the attack on me, which he was preparing, bears date Dec., 1846. Mr. Greene's letter, notifying me that he had suggested to W. W. to stop the discussion, is dated 7th Jan., 1847. Not long after this, I received a number of the *Christian Mirror*, with W. W.'s name on it. It contained a short piece from W. W.—but there was no allusion in it to me—that part of the piece had been suppressed—from a pencil-marked note in the margin, I gathered that the attack on me would not come out.

How promptly W. W. followed the hint from the Rooms to stop. Now, can any one doubt that his former pieces were published with the consent of the Secretaries? He tells me “it fell into his unworthy hands.” The Secretaries both speak doubtfully about W. W.'s seeing papers at the Rooms; but he is positive, that he had free access to all he desired, and that he spent most of a week there thus employed. Which are we to believe?

In answer to my first private letter to W. W., in which I confined myself to a simple and respectful application for information on points connected with his published statements, while he would give me no satisfaction, he threw out this threat: “I speak advisedly on all points depending on testimony. For your own sake do not force me to make public what as yet is *covered* in my own desk, now beneath my sheet. I had too much care for my own reputation, not to say for that of others, and *for the truth*, to publish what truth did not demand, and will not completely sustain.”

Three or four times he was urged to say what it was that he kept back, and held *in terrorem*—all in vain. He would give no explanation. This is the man, who suppressed the information which he received from Wolcott! This is the defender of the Secretaries! This is the man, that like the Secretaries, makes statements, which documents in their own possession prove are not true, and when called on for the proof of their statements will not answer!!

I think that most candid persons will say that I have made as many applications, both to the Secretaries and others, who know the facts of the case, as was proper. I had a sincere wish that the matter might be put on such a footing as would be fair, without much public discussion, and without dwelling on some points which would be especially unpleasant. All has been in vain. If I now make statements which wound missionaries and their friends, *I beg them* to recollect that the course of the Secretaries has caused it. If the Board, and the mission cause, as managed by its present agents, suffer, their Secretaries may be held responsible. Nor let the *real friends* of missions fear that all God's promises will fail, all God's work remain undone, if facts come out which shake confidence in the management of the Secretaries of the A. B. C. F. M.

It has been my wish to pass lightly over the course taken by the

missionaries in relation to myself. Nor will I now say much. It has been alledged by W. W. again and again, after repeated intercourse with the Secretaries, that the missionaries opposed my appointment. He specifies "Smith and others," in his private letters, and expresses *surprise* that I seem not to know it. When the case is put to the Secretaries they refuse to answer. True, Dr. A. did give a different account in 1839, but now when the declaration is publicly made, and made to disparage me, he will not say! The inference is a fair one, that opposition was made. This, at least, the public are allowed to believe, for the Secretaries will not deny it. Who besides Mr. Smith opposed, is not said, nor can the Secretaries nor W. W. be brought to say. Did those others belong to the Syrian Mission? * Messrs. Temple and Adger both wrote home; they were located at Smyrna and belonged to the Turkish, and not the Syrian Mission. Was it either of them? We are left to conjecture. I know both of them tried to draw out my opinion as to their policy—the sapping and mining policy—and argued against my views when I objected to their plan.

I here made several remarks. I had through Goodell and Dwight an invitation to remain at Constantinople and join that mission, and I am sure Temple knew this, and I doubt not Adger did. At the special request of the Beirut station, I agreed to remain there, and this I feel sure was known to the stations at Jerusalem and Cyprus. My letter to Dwight stated this fact to the brethren at Constantinople, and that letter was read by the brethren in Smyrna. I gave my views of mission policy by special and written request. It had been several times sought, and I was specially requested by, at least, two of the brethren, *not to write home*. I supposed a friendly interchange of views was wanted. That was what I desired, as my letters show. I did not know that this policy had the sanction of the Committee, until in answer to my letters to Dwight,

* NOTE. Both Temple and Adger, who wrote home against my views of mission policy, and Lanneau, who argued against them at the general meeting, Beirut, 1837, have all left the mission work, and returned home. So has Houston, who advocated the same policy in Greece. Mr. Smith, who was the chief advocate of the "sapping and mining" policy, has been about half his time, possibly more, absent from his field. He has made three visits to the United States, staying nearly a year, or more, each time, and of course his passage between the U. States and Palestine has been paid seven times. Mr. Thomson, who was for an open, Scriptural course, has been at his post from the word, go. It is a great thing to have friends at the Rooms. Those brethren were receiving their support from the Rooms, and knew I was at my own cost. From Oct. 1836, when I agreed to remain, up to May, 1838, I filled the department assigned me to the best of my ability. I gave up my correspondence with a religious paper and the compensation, in order to do it. Mr. Thomson assured Dr. A. that I aided in all the ways I could. A person who had the best means of knowing, informed the Rooms that they never knew any one do more mission work the first year. The Secretaries have decided that I am entitled to *nothing*, and have not given me one dollar, while they were paying bishop Carabet a salary at Beirut, from some time before I reached that place until just before I left, he doing nothing—possibly on the plan followed with the Nestorian bishops—paying for influence. He had been employed—his work stopped, but his salary continued.

Brewer, and others, Mr. Goodell sent me the instructions to Stocking, Holiday and Leyburn. This sanction of the Committee was all new to me. My views differed from that of the majority, but were the same with some of the most active members. With the knowledge, and as I considered, the approbation of the brethren, I offered my services to the Board. As the mission at Constantinople, with the knowledge of that at Smyrna ; as the station at Beirut, with the knowledge of those at Jerusalem and Cyprus, had invited me to stay, and not a whisper of dissent was heard during the time, nearly a whole year, I was kept waiting to hear from the Rooms, and was aiding, to the best of my ability, the mission work, what are we to think of those brethren who would underhandedly oppose and protest against my appointment, and conceal that fact from me ? What would be said of such conduct in this country ? And are ministers of Jesus Christ, who are sent to preach the Gospel of purity and peace, and who are supported by the contributions of God's people, to be tolerated in a course which would disgrace a person in any moral and respectable society ? We say it now while we have forborne to do it before, and those *brethren affected* may put it to the account of the course of the Secretaries, that the conduct of Dwight and Smith, Temple and Adger, and all who knew of the mode taken to draw out my opinion, under the implied promise of not writing home, for I had a right to expect a reciprocity in the matter, and then wrote home, reporting my views, and sent protests it would seem, and while the matter was concealed from me, such conduct ought to discredit any man, or any set of men.

I but add, it is a fair sample of the outworking of the principles of the policy they were following as missionaries. "Sapping and mining" was the significant expression by which its advocates used to describe it ; their treatment of me was only an application of the principles to my case, which they were daily applying to those corrupt churches. And while the policy is now professedly abandoned abroad, except perhaps in the mission to the Nestorians, what a striking example we have in this whole case, of its present workings at the Rooms !

Why was the peculiar policy followed in regard to the Oriental churches so long concealed from the churches at home ?

A peculiar organization called the Mediterranean mission church was formed under Dr. Anderson's direction in 1829, and was to embrace all the missions to the Oriental churches. Its design was manifestly to keep converts from leaving those corrupt churches, and in accordancy with this plan, their mode of procedure was to be regulated. Those superstitions, which make those churches corrupt, and those errors which make them apostate, were but indirectly to be touched. Information was to be promoted through schools, and reformation by preaching against personal sins. Now why was this plan of working not made known to the churches at home ? I verily believe that not one Christian in a thousand, who raised the money to support the missions, had any correct idea of

it. I had taken the *Missionary Herald* from 1814, but until I saw the plan at work in the mission field, I gathered no correct idea from the dark glimpses published in the *Herald*. The missionaries knew this. Hence Goodell, Dwight, Temple, Whiting and Smith, refer to it, and I am urged not to write home, and told "the people at home can't understand it as well as those in the field. I entreat you again not to write home." Mr. Temple tells me, "I do not wonder at all, that you entertain the views you express, for I presume they are entertained by a large proportion of the Christians, not to say of the ministers in our country, and I certainly entertained them substantially only ten years ago. Men like yourself and me, who have advanced half a century in the career of life, do not easily change their views on what they regard important subjects." Mr. Temple had about this time written home *his account* of my views, and in this last sentence, he alludes, I have no doubt, to the true reason why my age, (near 50,) was made so great an objection. I had given my views pretty fully, and there was not much hope that I would turn the *somerset* which he had done ten years before. While there was hope in my case, I was invited to remain, first at Constantinople, then at Beirut; but when I would hold to the old, plain, open, common sense plan, I was given up as hopeless; and according to W. W., after repeated conferences at the Rooms, the missionaries thought and protested to the Committee that I *ought* not to be appointed; and all was concealed from me, for nearly twelve months, much of it until I reached the United States, and a part of it until lately, when it was found convenient to use it, through the agency of W. W., to destroy my character, *if possible*, and prevent my statement of mission policy from being believed!

I do not believe that one in a thousand of church members did then, or do now, understand the true nature of the plan followed. I do not believe that one in twenty of the corporate and honorary members of the Board fully understand how the matter has been managed; and I give as a reason for this opinion, they could not learn it from the publications of the *Herald*. It does not give a full account—it is partial, and at times notoriously unfair. Where does it clearly indicate the change of policy made in 1829, from the open, aggressive plan, to what Goodell and Temple called the "sapping and mining" policy? Where does it state the facts about ceasing to print, and almost ceasing to circulate, while there were many still on hand, every book that pointed out any of the prevalent superstitions and fatal errors of those churches? Where will you find in the *Herald* such notices of the plan of working as Mr. Goodell gives in a letter, dated Feb. 25, 1832: "I have not, myself, given away a single book, in or out of school, which I supposed would give the least offense to the Greeks, and I enjoined it upon the teachers to pursue the same prudent course. I had an interview with the Greek Patriarch, before I received your letter, and requested him to throw out of those books which we were using in the schools, any thing which he had any objection to,

which he readily engaged to do, and is now examining them for the purpose. I thank you for mentioning your Greek bishop's report, as it will put me more on my guard in regard to his operations here, though I have all along been particularly careful, determining that all other interests should be sacrificed for those of the schools."* Here we have a *Greek censorship* submitted to, as to *all books* used in the *schools*, and the *proposal comes from the missionary*.

Where will you find an account of the resolution of the Syrian mission, acted on for years, not to circulate Mr. Bird's book, although it had been prepared with great care, and printed at Malta, at a cost of from \$400 to \$600 ; or any other book touching the errors of those churches, unless in very special cases ?

I venture the opinion that the Prudential Committee *itself* did not fully understand the extent to which that policy was followed, and do not understand it *now*. Among a good many reasons which I have for this opinion, I give the following: I know from Dr. A.'s own statement that the Committee does not see all the papers that come to the Rooms, and that important papers discussing the "sapping and mining" policy, have not been shown them. The fullest discussion of it that has taken place, was kept back from them, except some short extracts which were published, and *those all on one side*.

Again, we have an account of the meeting at Smyrna, April, 1838, at which the subject of mission policy is represented as considered. This account is used as an introduction to the extracts from Adger, Temple, and Smith, all put in the best form possible at the Rooms, and *positively altered* in several respects to give more effect, and keep out of view the fact that all these extracts belonged to a desperate defense of their policy, against arguments I had brought to bear against it. There are in this account several statements calculated, if not designed, to deceive. On page 117, April Herald, 1838, after referring to the discussions among the missionaries of the Board, it is said, "In regard to the Scriptural and proper method of procedure, they seem to have been of one mind." Now the Secretaries must have known that this was not the fact. There was, there had been *all along*, a diversity of views, and a *pretty decided* opposition by some to the "sapping and mining" plan, which the majority favored. Secretary Armstrong admitted directly to me that "they knew" Mr. Thomson's views agreed with mine. They could hardly be ignorant of the fact that others agreed with Thomson. Again, in the account of Mr. Smith's manner of preaching, as I have already shown, they have wholly altered the sense, by *leaving out the qualifying clause*. A highly intelligent layman, to whom I showed the statement in the Herald, and that in the letter, said at once that in the Herald it was false.

Again, in making the Committee recommend Mr. Smith's late

* NOTE. See Syracuse Recorder, Sept. 3, 1846, whence this extract is taken.

statement, that the Syrian Mission, *all along*, both in preaching and in the books published, have followed an "aggressive policy," they make them sanction what the Secretaries must know was not true. They must know that there has been a change from the open, and plain method, to the "sapping and mining," and then back again.

Now in these several cases I am slow to believe that men of the standing the Prudential Committee are said to have, would, if they knew the real state of the case, give their sanction to what is not true. The more charitable opinion is, that they have not so made themselves masters of the case, as to see the error they are made to endorse. They trust to the Secretaries; and the Secretaries do not put them in possession of all the facts of the case. Not to admit this is to shut ourselves up to the necessity of believing that the Committee have concurred with the Secretaries in putting out statements which are not true, and which they know are not true, and which deceive the churches. It is not easy to stretch the mantle of charity so as to cover the Secretaries. They must know that "the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth," has not been told; that a fair and truthful impression has not been made.

After most of the above was written, I received some information, which I may here insert. On receiving information from Mr. Greene, that my appeal from the Secretaries to the Prudential Committee was read to them, and that while they refused to take up the case, or read the letters therein referred to, they had still declared that it was not "seen that any injustice had been done me by any one connected with the Rooms," it struck me as most singular conduct. I could reconcile it neither with their reported character, nor with their regard to duty, as the depository of executive power. A suspicion arose in my mind, as it did in that of others, that either the matter had not at all come before them, or come in such form as prevented it from being understood. How to ascertain this fact was not obvious. I had ample evidence of the disposition of the Secretaries to refuse information. Months passed, and no mode seemed to offer. We had tried several gentlemen, who were supposed to have influence at the Rooms; all declined giving any aid. At length we received a friendly letter from a gentleman, who had heard something of our case. At our request he called at the Rooms and made inquiries on several points; among others desired the *names* of those members of the Prudential Committee to whom my appeal was read. July 20th, 1847, as reported by Mr. Greene. *Their names were refused.* Now why this, if all was fair and honest? Am I not justified in the belief that it never came properly before the Committee, so as to be understood?

As the existence of the mission church had been denied by W. W. who gave the Secretaries as his authority, I requested our friend to see those reports of the meetings above referred to, and take copies of such portions as related to the mission church. This was refused. The Secretaries said, in effect, that it was not

known whether there were such reports, or where they were, if there were any ; and that it was not known what they contained. Here again—W. W. has free access, and gains, or pretends to gain, information, which he uses to disparage my character ; and when application is made to the Rooms for information to show its want of truth, that information is refused.

Our friend gained at the same time, other information, which had before been withheld, although applied for repeatedly. It was admitted that “no protests,” or “remonstrances,” came from the missionaries. W. W.’s statement, therefore, although repeated again and again, and after visits to the Rooms, is *at least contradicted* by the Secretaries. Which now is to be believed ? And why could not this statement have been given while W. W.’s statement was before the public, and that for the avowed purpose of discrediting my statement ? Are we to believe that the object was to let his assertions have their designed effect, until the whole matter would pass from the public mind ?

The want of a recommendation from the mission, was spoken of to our friend, as greatly against my application, and as equivalent to a remonstrance. Now I know that Dr. A. was informed that it *was not known* to be needed—and *I know also* that while in his letter to me, and also in that to the mission, he spoke of this rule requiring it, he *so stated the case* as to make the impression that the matter was now settled. I had “waited only to be disappointed.” Most assuredly I was given to understand that the members of the mission drew the inference from Dr. A.’s letter, that he *did not wish them to send a recommendation*. I inferred this from his letter to me, and when I saw his letter to the mission I did not doubt that their inference was correct. Some other reasons were put forward, which seemed to hide the true one, but I believe that Dr. Anderson knows before God that they were not the true ones. Rev. J. Bird frankly gave the true one to my friends. My “views of mission policy,” and in a few days after seeing them, I saw Rev. Dr. Armstrong, and he, as I understood him, distinctly admitted that my views of mission policy, my opposition to the sapping and mining system, was the true reason. Now why all this shuffling, and trickery, and double-dealing, and putting out false reasons ? While conversing on this matter with our friend, Dr. A. alluded to a letter, received about the time my offer of service was made, which contained “a phrase,” as he said, which was considered as opposed to my receiving an appointment, and said a following letter stated that said inference was correct. When requested, he brought forward the letter, but would not permit our friend to read it, nor give the name of the writer. Nor was the “phrase” given. Now what on earth might not be proved in that way ? Why thus conceal, if there was truth in the matter ?

I suppose that I can explain the affair ; and the state of the case, I think, makes it proper I should do so. Dr. A. said it was not Mr. Smith, and I doubt not it was Mr. Thomson. When about to write to the Board, and make an offer of my service, I mentioned

it to him, and from what passed, I believed I had his and the mission's cordial concurrence. A letter of his accompanied mine to the Rooms. To this letter Dr. A. refers in his to me, and also in his letter to the mission, in a way that made Thomson feel unpleasantly, and drew from him a kind of explanatory letter to me, from which I make this extract. "*Dear Brother*, I did not know of the existence of any such rule as he, (Mr. A.) mentions in regard to the necessity of a regular recommendation by the mission. I never heard of the rule until I saw it in this letter; nor did it occur to me that it was necessary in your case. He says he could not make out whether I was in favor of your appointment or not. I am sorry I have not a copy of my letter; I have, however, a very distinct recollection of all I wrote. I said very little, and for this plain reason, that it never occurred to me that there was any doubt of your appointment, nor did such a thought arise in my mind, until after I heard of the severe pecuniary distress of the Board. I stated that it seemed preposterous for me to recommend you to them, for they were better acquainted with you than I was. I also knew that you had a personal interview with some of them before you left America. The only point on which I thought information important, was that of the language; and I stated that you were very diligent and laborious in studying Arabic and Italian. This explanation, I feel has been called for, by the terms of Mr. Anderson's letter."

All will, I think, agree that in the above letter Mr. T. intended I should believe that he had been and was in favor of my appointment.

Shortly afterwards he forwarded to us the following :

"October 30, 1837.

"DEAR BROTHER PAXTON.—The following is a copy verbatim of what I have this day written to Mr. Anderson in reference to your case :

'You (Mr. Anderson) would doubtless think it strange should I close my letter without making any reference to the case of Mr. and Mrs. Paxton. We thought it singular that your letter to us contained nothing in regard to Mr. P., who has so long been connected with us in labors and sufferings. When I wrote the letter to which reference is made in your answer to Mr. P., I had no knowledge of the rule requiring the *mission* to recommend in such cases, nor do I now know where such a rule is to be found.* I could have wished that my name had not been introduced in the way it was in your reply.

'Mr. P. requested me to mention to you, when I wrote, that his residence in this country had not been at the expense of the Board; I have previously in my letters mentioned that Mr. P. had cheerfully rendered us every assistance in his power, especially in con-

* Dr. A. subsequently informed me that he spoke of *usage as the rule*; but no case constituting the usage was given. Compare this with Miss. Herald, page 364, 1839, where the Committee say, "It is the peculiar prerogative of arbitrary and despotic power to keep its laws undefined, unwritten, and unpublished."

ducting the English service, both on the Sabbath and on week days.

'The question has arisen among us, whether Mrs. P., by marrying out of the mission, has ceased to be one of its members or not. Some think there is a rule on the subject, but I know not where it is. I do not ask the question because we have any practical difficulty on the subject, but if there be a rule it is important that we know it.

'Mrs. P. requested that nothing should be written to the Rooms about her case by any one except herself; but I could not, with my views of what was proper respect to the Secretaries, pass the subject entirely over.'"

The last paragraph was to me, and refers to a request Mrs. P. made, that as Dr. A. had not mentioned her case, and, as he said, he could not "make out" Mr. Thomson's meaning in regard to myself, it might be left to her to make inquiries at the Rooms respecting her own case. As her request was not granted, she waited the result of the inquiries made by the mission. About the middle of April, nearly six months afterwards, we received a packet of newspapers from the Rooms, which contained extracts of the minutes of the general meeting of the Board, Sept., 1837, and found Mrs. P.'s name dropped from the list of missionaries. (See *Christian Mirror*, Sept. 28, 1837, *Evangelist*, Sept. 23, N. Y. *Observer* do.) No letter came to us, nor did we receive any notice that special information on her case had come to the mission, until about a month later. The reason assigned for not informing us sooner, was that the mission was not requested to impart the information to us that Mrs. P. was no longer regarded as connected with the mission—that it was thought to be the duty of the Secretaries, and it was not doubted but that they had, or would do it in their own time and way.

Supposing the erasure of Mrs. P.'s name in the papers sent us, was designed to be our notice, we began our preparations for a return to the U. States, and as soon as we could get ready, and procure a passage, we left Palestine.

The above two letters, I doubt not, are the two letters to which Dr. A. referred in his conversation with our friend, but refused to let him read, or even to know the writer's name. Why Mr. Thomson, after referring to the subject, said so little in his last letter, may possibly surprise, after reading his apology to me for the ambiguity of the first. It certainly surprised me when I received it. I thought the case needed explanation, and wrote a note to Mr. T., from which the following is taken.

Nov. 4th, 1837.

"*Brother Thomson*,—I feel sure that you did not intend that the extract of your letter sent me should have caused us as much pain as it has, and yet I know not how you could write, copy and send it, without seeing that it must renew and deepen our unpleasant feelings. After thinking on the matter, I have thought that the most brotherly course on my part was frankly to let you know it, and thus give room for any explanation you may wish to give. Possi-

bly you have reasons which justify you, and possibly you did not happen to take the view of the matter which it is natural for us to take.

"Your letter relative to us, seems to me to do, on the main points, precisely the reverse of what the state of the case called for.

"As regards Mrs. P., she had a decided preference that it might be left to her to write to the Rooms on her own case. The Committee had not touched her case in their letters. Why could not her request be granted? Why so urgent to have the Committee act on it, and that without one intimation in your letter that she might still be useful, or that the members of the mission or station would be pleased to have her remain, or any reference to her desire still to labor in that cause to which, at a greater sacrifice of early and relative ties than perhaps any of the Syrian Mission, she had devoted herself? How are we to understand this, brother Thomson? You might have spared us this second trial. You are the last person in the whole mission that I would have expected such a thing from. I have felt this last matter more than I did the answer from the Committee.

"As regards myself, the very thing which the Committee wished to know—the *thing* which Mr. Anderson dwells on, even to your annoyance—the expression of an opinion as to my appointment—is passed over without one solitary word. Mr. A. and the Committee will be precisely where they were, except as they make inferences from your silence; and those inferences must, as it seems to me, be wholly against me.

"You are mistaken, if you think that I am trying to get an expression from you, the station, or mission, as may enable me to apply again with more success;—I have decided not to apply again. I decided this soon after I received Mr. A.'s letter, and wrote home to that effect. So far as I have plans, they look to another quarter. But I am not yet decided as to what I shall do, nor can I be until I hear from my agent. Possibly I may leave as soon as my pecuniary matters will admit.

"I have to request you and Mr. Hebard to give me a frank and full statement of your views and feelings in respect to those points in which I suspect I have been unfairly represented to the Committee. Such as my views respecting the mode of conducting missionary operations, and especially whether I have urged them improperly as to time and manner—my influence on the harmony of the mission—the general character of my intercourse with the mission—and whether you felt cordial towards me as a co-worker, &c.

"And let it be distinctly understood, that if you feel any hesitancy as to my age, you need have no delicacy in saying so. I feel satisfied that if it be distinctly understood that I was not appointed because it was thought that at my age (near 50) I might do more to promote the cause of Christ in my own language than to try to gain the Arabic, I would lose nothing in the eyes of the pious and judicious. Age is honorable if found in the way of righteousness. Dr. Reed, with whom I went to London, told

me before I left him that he thought of going to India as a missionary. He was about my age. He afterwards did offer himself, but was not sent out, because it was thought, as I learned, that at his time of life he might be more useful in England. How he felt I know not, but his character did not suffer for his zeal in the mission cause.

"No brother need fear that he will lose my good opinion by a frank statement of his opinion; but I do feel hurt at a silence which will bear *any evil construction*. It is to my feelings ten times more wounding than any thing that any of you can have to object against me. I perhaps would not feel the matter so much but for a reason of which you know. I know that Mr. Temple wrote home, and very probably Mr. Smith did. Mr. Temple's letter, as he admits, was read to Mr. Smith, and Mr. S. wrote to me about the same time. His letter, as you may recollect, exhibits much feeling, and virtually contains a pretty heavy charge of introducing divisions and alienation, and changing the course and prospects of the mission.* Now from this letter I think I may infer what he wrote home, if he did write, and also in part, what was the character of the letter Mr. Temple read to him.

"I may be mistaken, but I think there were reasons operating on the Committee that do not appear. The rule they refer to is proper for residents. I was, however, but waiting to get an answer; and why take months to decide a case if already decided by a plain rule? I especially requested a speedy answer."

Mr. Thomson called and made a verbal explanation, the amount of which was, that while Mr. A.'s letter referred to a rule requiring a recommendation, the whole statement of the case, the allusion to the matter as now settled, I had "waited only to be disappointed," the utter absence of any intimation that the needful steps could yet be taken, all led to the inference that a recommendation was not wanted; and as I had decided not to apply again, the whole matter was passed over. He showed me Mr. A.'s letter to the mission, which up to that time I had not seen, and also the opinion of the Jerusalem station on it, agreeing with what he had inferred—that no action of the mission was asked or desired. The same statement in substance was made to Mrs. P. by Mr. Thomson and by Mrs. Hebard.

I did desire a statement as to the general facts of the case, as my letter above shows, and I once certainly thought Mr. Thomson promised to give it; but it never came to hand. The reason why it did not, I do not pretend certainly to know. I have, however, had a pretty decided opinion. Mr. Thomson held the same views of mission policy that I did, and I know that he spoke much more frequently and in much stronger terms of disapprobation of it than I did. He took the lead against it at the general meeting, and was the main cause of the passage of a resolution, referred to by Lanneau, to dissolve the mission church. He knew the grounds, on

* See Appendix—Note B.

which I believed that my views, as reported at the Rooms, were the cause of my not receiving an appointment, and he knew the unkind feelings of Smith towards him on account of his opposing the prevalent policy ; and he knew that a message from the Rooms could easily call him home. Who that knows human nature will wonder that he should, in such a state of things, wish not to stand too prominently on my side, or on the side of a policy which found no favor at the Rooms !

I know that Mr. Thomson about this time told me more than once that he thought it very uncertain whether he would be allowed to remain long at Beirut. In a letter which overtook me in Alexandria, he thus remarks :

“ I see myself left by the departure of sister P., the only remnant of the reinforcement of this mission which came out with me. I need not say how and where they have gone ; but the reflection often returns, that I shall soon follow them, either to the narrow house, or across the wide ocean. This has always affected my mind to the deepest solemnity, when I have allowed my mind to dwell upon it. Then, I have lost friends. Whether my conduct has been such as to leave a contrary impression on your minds, I can scarcely tell. One thing I know, and that is, that your departure has made a gap in the list of my friends which none in Syria can fill ; and the number of tried friends is by no means so large that we can lose them without feeling the wound deeply.”

Here he refers to his apprehensions that he would have to *cross the wide ocean*,—that none in Syria could fill our place. We alone had stood firmly by him in his advocacy of a plain, open, scriptural plan of operation. We were struck down and removed from the field—what would be his fate ? I do not much wonder that he should have drawn back from a more open opposition to what seemed to be the determination of the Committee, and the triumph of Mr. Smith and his sapping and mining policy.

I have little doubt that I had up to the last, the cordial good will, both of Mr. Thomson and Hebard, and their desire that I should remain ; if not, they must have acted with much duplicity. For, I affirm that Mr. Thomson, after my offer of services was not accepted, repeatedly *proposed plans* by which I might still remain and assist, although not connected with the Board. The same thing was mentioned to Mrs. P., by Mr. and Mrs. Hebard. A strong desire that we should remain was expressed, but the written statement of the facts, which I desired, was never given.

Rev. Mr. Ladd, of whom I asked, not a recommendation, for I did not want that, but a statement on the points on which I believed injustice had been done me, by those brethren who had written to the Rooms, replied in a note, Nov. 2, 1837 :

“ As you wished me to tell you frankly what my opinion is, as to what has been the character of your intercourse with the missionary brethren here, with reference to its tendency to promote peace and brotherly love among brethren, I will freely say, that having now resided here more than eight months, and having had good opportunity during that time, to form an opinion on the subject, I do

not think that your conduct has in any way been calculated to disturb the peace and harmony of the missionary circle, or in any respect do injury to those kind and fraternal feelings which ought to exist among the missionaries here. It is true that at our general meeting last spring, when you were requested to sit with us and take part in our discussions, you, as well as others present, expressed some views in regard to the manner of conducting missions, in which some of the brethren did not coincide, but during the discussion nothing was said or done on your part, that I am aware of, which was either offensive or improper, or impolite, or adapted to alienate the feelings of brethren ; and further, I have never known you to be fond of urging the above mentioned views upon the brethren or others, nor have I known you frequently referring to them, or mentioning them in any way. In short, I believe your conduct, since my residence here, and before, as far as I know, has been such in reference to the point in question, and in all other respects, as is becoming a missionary ; and I never heard any of the missionary circle here, or any others, express a different opinion.

Yours in Christian love, DANIEL LADD."

We may here specify several things and call attention to them. The Secretaries and Prudential Committee are the agents of a great religious institution whose object is to spread the gospel. Is it proper that these agents adopt and follow a policy, which for years is kept concealed from those who employ them ; a policy which those agents must know would not meet the approbation of the great body of their employers ? Who that knows the facts of the case can deny that this has been done ?

Is it right for missionaries who are sent out and supported by the churches, to adopt a policy, which they know would not be approved by those who supported them ? Is it right to use means to keep this fact from the knowledge of the churches and urge it on those who know the facts, not to let it be known ? Is not this a kind of deception practiced upon the churches ?

Is it honest and becoming for missionaries and secretaries to draw out the opinion respecting their policy from those who may visit the mission field, and this without letting their object be known, and then privately report it and use underhand means to keep from the field those who cannot be induced to fall in with their policy, and assign reasons other than the true ones for such a course ? Is not this Jesuitical ?

Is it allowable for the Secretaries to use the great power which their relation to the A. B. C. F. M., and their having several hundred thousand dollars annually to disburse, gives them, to assail, and to try to put down, any who may state facts which they know are true, but which the Secretaries have, either wholly or in part, kept from the churches ? May they put out statements which they know make a false impression ? suppress, or alter documents, give free access to the Rooms and documents to persons, whose object appears to be, to defend the policy of the Secretaries and assail, *per fas et nefas*, all who depart from it, while information is refused to those assailed, which is known to be in the Rooms, and would disprove the calumny ?

Is it honest, when a mission policy not fully known to the churches, has been followed for years, and then changed for a more open, scriptural method, to try to cover over the whole matter, and even bring the great influence of the Rooms to break down the character of those who know and state the facts of the case? Dr. Anderson was present at the conferences that originated the mission church,* and I doubt not it was mainly through his influence that the sapping and mining plan went into operation. Is it honest then for him to make statements which imply a denial, and by his refusal to correct W. W.'s statement, give his influence on the side of the denial of the whole?

Is it to be tolerated, that persons thus assailed for stating only the truth, should be refused documents, and other information at the Rooms, which they know are there, and will prove more than they have said?

Does it become the character of a missionary supported by the church, to refuse information respecting a policy which he had followed for years and often advocated, and thus by his refusal permit falsehood to prevail, and the character of one who had told the truth suffer; and all to cover over a policy formerly advocated, but now denied?

Is it allowable for missionaries to be encouraged, or tolerated, in privately sending home charges against others, or statements which affect them—cause them, it may be, to be recalled, while the person thus treated has no knowledge of the case, and no opportunity of defending himself or his opinions, however misrepresented he may be, or directly slandered? Not to dwell on my own case, take that of Rev. J. L. Merrick. And further, has no one observed the curious silence of the Herald on the whole matter, of the return of the four young brethren, who succeeded me in the Syrian Mission? Would they all say that no private communications were connected with their return in good health with their families to the United States?

Are we to have a revival of the doctrine that pious frauds are allowable—that we may deceive people for their good, or the supposed good of the church—or to conceal faults and blunders? The Scripture plan is to record the truth, even as to the faults of God's people, and draw lessons of instruction from them. 1 Cor. x: 1—15. All the apostacies and great errors of Israel are made matter of record, and used as warnings to others. Our Lord did not cover up the faults of his disciples, nor did they the errors of each other. When Peter acted with duplicity, Paul “withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed.” But it would seem that the mistake of the “sapping and mining” policy, the Jesuitical principles then acted on, must now be covered over and denied; and combined efforts made to deceive the churches, and destroy the character of those who stated the truth. Pretences are made that documents known to have been sent to the Rooms, and parts of which have been published, are now lost, or their place is not known.

* See Observations on the Peloponnesus, by A. Anderson, page 25 and 7.

Possibly they are lost—possibly destroyed. For I hold that persons who would withhold information, and shuffle and deny, as the Secretaries have done, might be expected to put away, or destroy documents, which, if seen, would detect and expose their course.

The Jesuits have secret depositories, known only to the initiated, for papers which they use when needed to effect their purposes; but to which none may have access but themselves. The churches which support the missions have a right to *good assurance* that the records of the mission work are well kept, and rightly kept—that the truth of history is not falsified—that a false account of policy and of persons is not palmed on the churches—that defamatory charges are not made and privately deposited at the Rooms, of which the person injured may have no knowledge, and thus have no means of refuting. When the parties are dead, these may be found and used to the great injury of individuals, and vexation of their friends.*

What evidence have we that the truth has been duly regarded up to the present time, either in the general statements made at the Rooms, the documents published, or those preserved or destroyed? I know of no security but the supposition that the Secretaries are true and faithful to their trust. Now do they act on oath? Are their doings reviewed? Are all their official acts investigated by competent persons? The above denials and refusals to give information, the alledged ignorance about documents, parts of which have been published, all look the other way.

What evidence have we that the Prudential Committee really look into, and decide those cases, which are supposed to be decided by them? Do they keep a record of their meetings? of the members present? of the business brought forward? of those who voted for and against? and the reasons for their decision? Is the matter so managed, and the records so kept, as to prevent a full and fair history of the case, which may be reviewed and appealed to, as an authentic document? This is the way matters are managed in most other bodies, which act as agents; and all agents ought thus to act, and be able at all times to show clean hands.

Is it the Committee that are not willing to meet the responsibility of letting their names be known, or is it the Secretaries who do it for them, and possibly without their knowledge? We have high authority for saying, "that every one that doeth truth cometh to the light," but that those "who love darkness" belong to another class.

That the Secretaries should strive to retain their places, and salaries, and irresponsible power, we can readily suppose. When did imperfect human nature, of its own accord, give up place and power and wealth? The recall of Bradley and Caswell for claiming to be more perfect than the executive can allow its missionaries to be, is sufficient proof that the Secretaries lay no claim to perfection themselves. All may be expected to hold on to their places, and salaries, and power, as long as the churches can be made to bear it.

*See Appendix. Notes A and B.

Nor do we doubt but there will be some to advocate their cause. This has seldom, if ever, been lacking to those who exercised arbitrary and irresponsible power. Luther said "every man had a Pope in him;" the Pope always has had friends, and his Popeship in the agency may be expected to have some.

But how the American Board, and those who have at heart the cause of pure religion, of civil and religious rights—those who know how place and power are sure to effect human nature—those who are not ignorant of the notorious fact that associations of men, and even of good men, can hardly be said to have a conscience; and will often do, or suffer to be done by those who love to have the pre-eminence, what they, in their individual capacity, would scorn to do;—how those who desire the mission cause to advance, and pray for God's blessing on it, should be willing to let matters go on as they have done, we do not know. We close with assenting to the opinion, which we have heard expressed by persons who have proved their attachment to the Board, that unless the evils of the present mode of management are corrected, the Board must, before long, meet a great reversion, and the cause of missions receive a great injury.

APPENDIX.

NOTE A. While I designed to be plain and frank in my letters, I designed to be kind and respectful; and that I was, may be inferred from the testimony of the brethren to whom I wrote. Mr. Dwight says, "your letter is now before me. It seems to have been written in a good spirit, and I hope has been received in a good spirit. It is a frank and brotherly expression of opinion, and as such I receive it, and thank you for it; and although even in the main points of your letter, I cannot agree with you, yet I hope it will do good, both to me and to my fellow-laborers, who have read it." Mr. Temple said, "It was frank, kind, and Christian, in its spirit, and he trusted would do them all good, though he dissented from some of its practical views." All of these brethren, in arguing against my views, do me a manifest injustice. They represent me as in favor of doing almost nothing but attacking the errors and superstitions of those churches, and that in a violent way. The following passages show this, while they also show their plan.

Dwight says, "You would have us come out openly, and boldly and directly attack the errors of those eastern churches; such as praying to the Virgin and saints, the worship of pictures, confession to a priest, fasting, as they practice it, &c.; and because we do not do this, you charge on us a radical defect in our system of measures." "I beg you will fix your mind on this one point: the difference between preaching the gospel, that is, all that pertains to man's lost estate by nature, and salvation through a crucified Savior alone, and preaching directly against forms and ceremonies, and errors and superstitions. If you revolve this in your mind a little, I think you may be relieved of some of your difficulties."

Adger thus states his plan : " I would specify the perpetual virginity and worship of the Virgin, intercession of saints and angels, purgatory, confession, &c. *id omne genus*. In my opinion, we should be leaving our ministry to serve tables, or doing worse, if we should give our time to such matters. These miserable superstitions, and all others of this class, would be better left aside, while we march up to the citadel of the people's hearts and use against it the law and the gospel, telling them with all plainness of their personal sins, and pointing them to Christ as their personal Savior. Let us but get a lodgment for him in their hearts, and those other objects will relax their hold immediately and for ever." Extracts need not be multiplied ; it is sufficient to give a few of the expressions which were used to represent my views, and which do me great injustice. No such expressions can be found in my letters. " A denunciatory plan," " assaulting," " attacking," " the knock down and drag out system," " a warlike spirit," " a fiery spirit," " battering rams," " thunder and lightning," &c. The expressions were used in letters to me and to Mr. Thomson, and in letters sent to the Rooms, provided those were true copies of those sent us. And to some such unfounded charges W. W. may refer, and hold up *in terrorem*.

The Committee, as may be seen, April Herald, 1838, adopted the plan of conceding that but one of two plans can be followed. " The one is to expose and assault the errors and superstitious rites of the people, and attempt to compel them by argument to abandon their false refuges and embrace the truth ; the other is, to hold up clearly before their minds the doctrines and precepts of the Bible, in their spiritual meaning and application, and press on their attention the importance of holiness of heart and life, but without making any direct attack on their present system of belief in their ceremonial observances, supposing that when the leading truths of the gospel shall be understood and received by them, their errors and heartless formalities will soon be removed."—Page 117. Now we never advocated either of these modes, in the exclusive way in which they are here stated. Our position *always* was that, together with the clear setting forth of law and gospel truth, well confirmed with scripture quotations, there ought to be a clear pointing out of those errors and superstitions which obscured, perverted and neutralized it. We advocated the same plan which Mr. Smith in his late numbers affirms " has always been followed." In a note, which follows it will be seen that he was grieved *almost to death*, in 1837, at the apprehension that the sapping and mining policy was, through my influence, changed for the open and aggressive plan.

NOTE B. " You speak of a responsibility resting upon the elder brethren, who have taken the lead in this course, which you condemn ; and is there no responsibility connected with taking the lead in such a course as you recommend—a course which almost all of the elder brethren here have tried and abandoned—a system which, if adopted at Beirut, threatens to change the prospects of that lovely mission, just now organized into a system of thoroughly

evangelical operations, promising, if carried on perseveringly, to do so much good; to say nothing of the harmony which has hitherto characterized it in so marked a manner? My feelings on this subject are stronger than I can express. To return to Beirut and feel there the vacancy God has already made, is what I can scarcely bear; but to return there and find besides this, those operations, the organization of which had occasioned many delightful hopes, condemned and endangered before time has been allowed at all, sufficient to see their results, it seems to take away almost all the remainder of my desire to live. For I have not the least idea that at Beirut the change is called for, nor have I any doubts as to its general results."—Extract of his letter to me, 1837, which was sent to the Rooms, and that fact concealed from me until I reached the U. S.

All must see that this expresses dissatisfaction with me, and implies the charge of causing dissensions, and greatly injuring the prospects of the mission. There was no truth in his charges. There were no dissensions, that I know of, before he came. All that I had done was, to answer Dwight's written request to give him my views of mission policy. In illustrating the matter I specified several things which I had learned at Beirut, and nearly, if not exactly, in the language in which I had learned them. Mr. Thomson assured me that Mr. Smith admitted that he had labored under a mistake as to the changes which he thought had been made and which he charged on me.

On seeing the extracts from the letter which contained those charges, I wished to know whether, as common justice and honesty required, he had corrected the false impression made at the Rooms by his letter. I was informed that no correction had come. There was time after he reached Beirut, and found that his charges were false, and knew of my offer of service, to have corrected it, before my offer was answered. This he did not do.

NOTE C. We think the history of the missions to the Oriental Churches will present many points to show that it would have been well not to have committed the mission work wholly to young men, but to have sent some men of more age and experience. Most of the young men have gone into plans of expediency—have tried experiments—many of them have made "somersets" into the sapping and mining plan, and back again, which men of more age would hardly have done.

We do not believe many old men would have expended as much in publishing school books, while there was such a reading population, who had no book containing a clear exposition of gospel truth, contrasted with the errors of those churches. We much doubt whether men of age and experience would have gone in for a new Arabic type. The old English Arabic type was declared by Temple in 1825, (*Herald*, page 271,) to be "of rare and peculiar excellence." The set procured proved to be not entirely complete, but its defects might have been supplied at a small cost, compared with that of the new type, which Messrs. Smith and Hallock spent several years in getting up. I have not been able to ascertain at

what cost, and I doubt whether any one knows, but the officers at the Rooms, and possibly Mr. Smith. I should not be surprised if its whole cost, counting in the salaries of Smith and Hallock, amounted to \$10,000, and I much question if, for general use, it is as good as the old; and if I am rightly informed, its wear and tear, and the expense through breakage, is much greater. I have have not found any who could tell the cost, and felt sure I could not get the information at the Rooms, where I have ever been refused information, in which I was specially interested.

Nor do I think old men would have employed so much time and money to publish an Arabic grammar, when there were so many grammars and so few to use them. The whole plan of throwing all on young men, is like that which some would adopt in our colleges and theological seminaries—place the sons before the fathers. The Bible plan was to give the rule and direction of things to the elders, but the wisdom of the nineteenth century is, in many things, correcting the errors of the past; and the Bible, and its old-fashioned doctrines and practices, have come in for their share of improvement.

There are many things which show that the character of the A. B. C. F. M. must be seriously affected by the attempts made to cover over or deny the policy which was so generally followed in the missions to the Oriental churches.

We will refer to one. While to the great mass of our Christian people, little is known of that policy, it was known and is remembered by many in those regions where those missions were located. A good many travelers, traders and official men as consuls and consular agents have so observed the plan as to know what it was. These stations have been visited by our naval vessels, and an interest manifested in the missionaries and their work. Inquiries have been made and information obtained as to the mode of operating. The American Mediterranean squadron came to Beirut under the command of Com. Elliot, just after a wide spread attempt was made in Greece, Turkey and Syria, to put down the mission schools, under the belief that through the schools, the missionaries were attempting to effect changes in the religion professed in those regions. The Commodore had been at Malta, Corfu, Athens, Smyrna and Constantinople. A violent opposition had shown itself against the mission schools at all these places which he had lately visited. The bishop had issued circulars against them; an ecclesiastical committee had opened a correspondence with the missionaries at Smyrna, and put the question directly to them, whether, under the pretence of conducting schools, they intended to change their religion. The missionaries had answered them in an English pamphlet, of above 40 pages, embracing the correspondence, and deny that they intend to make proselytes or induce persons to leave the Greek church. Any one, who will read the pamphlet, may see that the information really sought is not given. Whether the Commodore had seen this pamphlet or not, I do not know; but he put this question to me while dining with him on ship-board:

The missionaries do not mean or wish to change the religion of these people, do they? They only mean to promote education and improvements? That, was evidently his idea of their object. I replied, that we certainly wished to promote education and improvements, but that was not our great object. That was to bring back those Christians from the deep corruptions into which they had fallen. That Christianity as professed and held by them was another gospel, and one that would not save; that the great missionary object was to revive spiritual religion and recover those churches from those errors and gross superstitions which had taken its place. I do not pretend to give the precise words, but the substance of our conversation on this point. Names of persons of piety and intelligence might be added, who cannot be supposed to have been idle spectators of missionary proceedings. Now what will such persons think of efforts now made to make it out, as W. W. and E. Smith have done, that the open, aggressive plan has always been followed, in the face of what some of them have witnessed for years!



